

Social Questions Bulletin

Volume 44

JANUARY, 1954

Number 1

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization, seeks to deepen within the Church, the sense of social obligation and opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation stands for the complete abolition of war. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges. In seeking these objectives the Federation does not commit its members to any specific program, but remains an inspirational and educational agency, proposing social changes by democratic decision, not by violence.

SOME WARNINGS FOR 1954

Peace Not Yet Won

Elsewhere in this issue, under the heading **Bulletin Reader** **Complains**, we point out that the costly and threatening atomic and hydrogen arms race continues unabated despite all talk of peace and the fact that this particular arms race so clearly has reached an impasse. Not only is it true that arms races in history have not led to peace. This particular arms race, unless it is halted, points and leads us towards the greatest destruction of human life and values in history. If this arms race goes on, like earlier arms races, to war, it is an atomic or hydrogen war which no nation today can hope to win, and which all participants—and humanity as a whole—assuredly and inevitably will lose.

Korean Cease Fire Unsure

As for Korea, MFSA long urged and sought the lives-saving cease fire there achieved at last last summer. That cease fire was the greatest victory for peace in 1953. And some of the news from Korea is good. In a January 13, 1954, A.P. dispatch from Washington, we read:

The subject of Korea came up at President Eisenhower's news conference today. In response to a question, Mr. Eisenhower said he has heard no reports that the Communists are building up their military manpower in Korea in violation of the truce terms.

In general, he said, the evidence is that they are reducing their ground forces while digging strong defenses and doing a surprising amount of economic rebuilding.

But not all news from Korea is encouraging, the cease fire is not yet secure. The needed and promised political conference has not yet been planned. South Korean government leaders constantly attack efforts to negotiate peace with the North. And these leaders frequently threaten future armed assault on the North to subject it to South Korean government rule.

President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union message to Congress earlier this month, urged approval of the mutual defense pact (military alliance) with Mr. Rhee's South Korean government. That government has certainly not been curbed in its bellicose talk, or in its militaristic or expansionist drive, by U. S. assurances of continued decisive military aid and backing. Why not let the president and your congressmen know what you think of such deepening and long-term military involvement with the peace-threatening Rhee government? If we strengthen that government for, or join with it in, any renewal of military hostilities in Korea, let us remember that an even stronger China land power can counter our intervention once again with its own. In that event hostilities can be for us, and for all participants, more deadly, more suicidal, and more widespread and tragic even than before.

On Japanese Rearmament

A danger which enters with us into 1954 lies in our continuing pressure on Japan to rearm and thus abrogate its post-war constitution which the U. S. inspired, and which bans any future rearmament or warmaking. This danger was pointed out for us this month by none other than the anti-communist and reactionary government of South Korea, with its statement of

January 8: "Korea has been warning the United States against Japan for the last half century, but even with the costly experience of the Pacific war less than ten years old, the Americans are calling for Japanese rearmament and paving the way for another Pearl Harbor."

On Indefinite Unilateral Occupation of Conquered Territory

In his State of the Union message (Jan. 7, 1954), the president stated that "to advance the cause of freedom on foreign fronts . . . We shall maintain indefinitely our bases in Okinawa." That contradicts the statement of President Truman after World War II that we had no territorial ambitions, had gained no territory from that war, and sought none. It also contradicts the post-war position taken for American Protestantism by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace (chaired by Mr. John Foster Dulles) of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. That position opposed unilateral military occupation of territory taken from Japan by military conquest, and it asked instead for United Nations trusteeship, looking towards subsequent freedom for the Pacific peoples involved. It is the policy actually followed in the case of Libya and other African territories taken from Italy in World War II. In the past the U. S. A. symbolized opposition to colonialism and to foreign military occupation and domination, as the American Revolution had successfully aimed at defeating colonialism and driving foreign (British) armies from American shores, combined with the ringing Declaration that the Creator had endowed all men with the right to such liberty and such pursuit of happiness. Thomas Jefferson and other authors of the U. S. A. would find it strange indeed if the new American position before the world is that "to advance the cause of freedom" we advocate and practice military conquest and unilateral military occupation of foreign territory "indefinitely." Is any protest forthcoming from the National Council of Churches as it sees the moral principle it formerly urged, so sharply violated in the president's State of the Union message? Understandably, "Japanese newspapers expressed disappointment at his statement that the U. S. would maintain bases on Okinawa indefinitely." (N.Y. Times, 1-9-54.)

On Continued Intervention In Indo-China

The last MFSA Membership meeting called for an end to that intervention and also to the policy of Japanese rearmament (see report of MFSA program stands in Bulletin, Summer Issue, 1953). But this costly and dangerous policy goes with us into 1954, as shown by this State of the Union Message statement: "I shall ask the Congress to authorize continued material assistance to hasten the successful conclusion of the struggle in Indo-China." Is our policy that of decreasing our military involvement in Korea only to increase it in Indo-China? If so, it would seem that we are leaving the frying pan only to jump into the fire. If we were unable to achieve military domination over all Korea for Syngman Rhee, it will be even more difficult to achieve such domination over all Indo-China for the foreign French. On the Korean plains, our technological and air force superiority was a marked advantage. This is much less true in the jungles of Indo-China, where the guerilla tactics of our native opponents will be most difficult to counter. The long coastline of the sea-surrounded Korean peninsula gave special advantage to our

naval superiority, but there is much less of a role for the navy in Indo-China. Finally, the Chinese intervention which vetoed our intervention in Korea, can in future veto any victory for our further intervention in Indo-China—and perhaps with even more decisive effectiveness.

On Indo-China, the president added: "This assistance will bring closer the day when the associated states may enjoy the independence already assured by France." It shows a strange reading of history to suggest that a colonial power (France) can ever be trusted to fight a costly war for the real independence of its own and long-profitable colony! Press reports of Vice President Nixon's remarks after his recent far eastern tour are perhaps more honest and to the point. They indicate our government's real concern in Indo-China and elsewhere in Southeast Asia is not for the independence and equality of their long-subject and exploited peoples, but for the continued profitable use of their rich raw materials and natural resources, which white foreigners have so abundantly enjoyed in the now-waning colonial era.

Military Alliance With Formosa

The president was vigorously applauded by the Congress when he stated in his State of the Union Message: "We shall also continue military and economic aid to the Nationalist government of China." Thus we continue in 1954 the illusory, unrealistic and long-bankrupt stand that the government of the large and major power, China, is the decisively defeated and exiled government on Formosa existing still simply by sufferance of our intervening dollars and navy.

Let us remember that the army on Formosa is cut off from the youthful replacements necessary for any army's effectiveness, and that the soldiers there have been older year after exiled year. For us to give military encouragement to a regime which makes the absurd threat of attempting reconquest of the vast China mainland, is the open door to disaster. If any of our leaders consider sending American boys to that abyss, they should pause first to get advice from the Japanese invaders of yesterday who experienced what it means to get bogged down in that morass. And the China of today is vastly stronger and more united than the China of yesterday, as General MacArthur learned in Korea when he rejected India's advice to halt his troops at the 38th parallel and sent them on up to the Chinese border. It was a bitter and costly lesson indeed for many an American family. But the Korean disaster will appear as a teaparty in contrast if we move into the Armageddon of all-out war with China (and thus quite possibly with her Soviet military ally). New China's growing strength is also attested by every United Nations world or far eastern economic report, and by all press reports of China's vast industrialization and economic development now taking place under her own five-year plan.

When the U. S. joins the government of England, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Israel, Indonesia, India, Burma, Pakistan, and the bulk of the peoples of earth, in dealing factually with China and its new government—a vast step will have been taken towards an effective United Nations and towards stability and peace in the Far East and throughout the world. MFSA has long urged this, along with the Quakers, the former Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, and many others.

The vast and growing China market was formerly enjoyed by the U. S. but is now cut off from us by our own government's embargo policy, and thus increasingly diverted not only to the Soviet Union and its allies, but also to England and other of our western allies (and trade rivals). In consequence, some of our more conservative, but realistic, leaders (e.g., the strongly anti-Soviet Mr. Herbert Hoover) have been suggesting of late that we take a new look at China and its trade potentialities for us before we have lost our chance. In view of the growing unemployment here at home, such potentially profitable and job-creating suggestions may well prove more effective in the coming year. If so (and we should encourage it), the dangers of disastrous conflict with China will correspondingly diminish.

German Rearmament

As we go into 1954, our government's central policy in Europe continues to be that of pressing for the rearmament of Germany

and the rearmament of Germany's military alliance with us and with our other west European allies. This basic U. S. policy continues to meet firm resistance, understandably, not only from the Soviet Union and other east European nations, so recently the victims of armed German aggression, but from France which has suffered heavily from German aggression twice in one generation and from many other people in western Europe. Thus U. S. policy continues to meet serious obstacles in western Europe—partly because of the disaster-threatening economic burden of rearmament there, partly because of the vivid memory of recent brutal German aggression without any similar experience of Soviet aggression, and partly because of the increasing disbelief that any such armed attack is needed or planned by the Soviet Union or at all in that country's selfish interest.

MFSA has long considered dangerous any program which in effect would see the U. S. and the U.S.S.R. arm west and east Germany against one another. That would surely stimulate civil and international war and create a powder keg in the heart of Europe of greater potential danger to the world than ever was true of Korea when its two sectors were armed against one another. In the interest of peace, unification of Germany should be based (and probably must be based) not on its rearmament, but on its disarmament. Our policy actually has been that of asking the U.S.S.R. to withdraw its military forces from East Germany so Germany could be united, armed and allied militarily with the U.S.S.R.'s cold war antagonists (see article to that effect by James Reston in N. Y. Times, 10-12-53). Can our leaders possibly expect Soviet leaders to accept such a program? Would our leaders accept such a program for us if the shoe were on the other foot, and the Soviet Union were asking us to withdraw our forces so Germany could be united and armed and militarily allied against us with them? How much more hope there will be for all mankind if we foster developments in Germany which represent not a continuation of the arms race and cold war, but a beginning of their end!

Economic Downturn Continues

See documentation in November Bulletin for fact that, as 1953 ended, economic downturn had begun. Further recession trends have followed, including growing unemployment, as we will document in a later Bulletin. Peace is not secure nor guaranteed as we enter 1954. Neither is prosperity for the people.

Assault On Civil Liberties Undiminished

At a time when we should be regaining liberties lost, we are being asked to give up more. The hated police state practice of legalized wiretapping is proposed not by the lunatic fringe, but by the Administration itself through the Attorney General. The old fashioned American idea that in a free country a citizen is entitled to privacy, will be left behind along with the cherished notion that a man's home is his castle. The constitutional and cherished provision, won through great struggle by our forefathers, will be given up—that a man's home can be searched or privacy destroyed, only on presentation of a search warrant. Then dies the Anglo-Saxon principle that no citizen need be forced to testify against himself by words from his own mouth. Further effort to destroy that principle comes from the supplementary Administration proposal that Congress in effect legislate the Fifth Amendment (long a barrier to inquisition) out of meaningful existence. The Administration promises summary dismissal for government employees who stand on their constitutional rights under that amendment. Fortunately, there are lovers of traditional American liberties in the Congress (like Senator Wayne Morse), who promise a principled fight against the proposal for legalized wiretapping. And in the last Congress, southern congressmen valiantly opposed the specific proposition that it was the job of Congress to attack or undermine the Constitution its members had sworn to uphold—including the Fifth Amendment and Bill of Rights.

The most vigorously applauded section of the President's State of the Union Message to Congress was that proposing that only non-communists have allegiance to the United States and that communists should be deprived of citizenship as they are henceforth convicted under the undemocratic Smith Act (which the American Civil Liberties Union and a strong minority of the Supreme Court consider unconstitutional, since it prohibits not only overt illegal acts, but advocacy of proscribed ideas, such as those held by Marxists). It is a lesson of Hitler Germany

and other fascist lands that when we deprive communists of their citizenship rights, we rapidly go on to deny them to those to whom that unpopular label is falsely applied. As Abraham Lincoln long ago told Americans, we who participate in putting chains on any minority, are beginning to create chains and tyranny for all. Furthermore, in fact, it is highly questionable whether Congress, under our liberty-loving Constitution, has the right to deprive citizens of their citizenship merely because the deeds or philosophies of those citizens are displeasing to congressmen or other officials.

Any effort by Congress to do so might well conflict with the clear provision of the Fourteenth Amendment which states, without making exception, that: "All persons born . . . in the United States . . . are citizens of the United States, and of the state wherein they reside." And in the recent 1951 case of *Okamura vs. Acheson*, the Supreme Court ruled: "It is the view of this court that while the Constitution gives the Congress plenary power over citizenship by naturalization, it leaves the Congress no power whatever to interfere with 'American citizenship by birth.'" And with reference to that power over naturalization, a lower court had ruled in 1947 (in *re Gogal*): "The power of naturalization vested in Congress by the Constitution is the power to confer citizenship, not to take it away."

The past year saw attacks by officials, low and high, not only on today's Protestant ministry, but on the ancient literary figure of Robin Hood! After the Los Angeles Philharmonic auditorium closed its doors to Bishop Oxnham, Methodist Bishop Donald Harvey Tippettt exclaimed: "The United States is further along toward the police state now than Germany was when Hitler took over. It was once fashionable and economically advantageous to be a member of a church. Now it is dangerous, particularly if you are a Protestant, and even more particularly if you are a Methodist."

It is clear that Americans who continue to believe with their founding fathers in civil liberties for all, and in the Bill of Rights without emasculation, have a big struggle on their hands in 1954.

Scripture for Our Time

"And the prophet came to the king of Israel, and said unto him, go strengthen thyself, and mark, and see what thou doest: for at the return of the year the king of Syria (who had fought against Israel in the preceding year) will (again) come up against thee." (I Kings 20:22). The Syrians who fought us in 1953 will be back again in 1954 as the good fight continues for universal peace, abundance, and freedom.

J.R.M.

BULLETIN READER COMPLAINS

A Bulletin reader protested inclusion in the December issue of excerpts from President Eisenhower's U.N. speech, proposing international cooperation in atomic research and in development and distribution of some atomic energy for peaceful use. The complaining reader contends Bulletin readers will be led by the excerpts quoted to attach to the total Eisenhower or Administration program a positive evaluation, which is not deserved.

The Editor has more faith in Bulletin readers. In the November issue, we included excerpts from Mr. Truman's important speech at City College dealing with religious freedom. Was this because we wanted our readers to embrace Mr. Truman's total political program? Of course not! This Bulletin, like the Federation publishing it, is strictly non-partisan, and always has been so. Never in the past have we embraced the program of any secular party, nor is it our plan to do so in the future. The Bulletin is loyal to the Federation program democratically formulated and adopted by MFSA members in the annual membership meeting, and between meetings by the MFSA Executive Committee elected by the members. A continuing Bulletin purpose is to make available to its readers facts needed (and often neglected) in the struggle for a more fraternal world.

We shared excerpts from Mr. Truman's speech on religious freedom because the things he had to say at that particular time and place, and on that topic, were important and useful to our readers and members in our current struggle against committees of inquisition for full religious freedom.

Similar motives led us to excerpt Mr. Eisenhower's speech on atomic energy in the December Bulletin. The use of atomic energy, for death or for life, is of decisive importance for the future of mankind. It, therefore, behooves us and all people to

consider fairly, objectively, and seriously, any proposal made in the name of peace—coming from either of the world's two major atomic-industrial powers. (See below excerpts from Soviet counter proposals or supplementary proposals in reply to Mr. Eisenhower.)

For years the Methodist Church (since the 1948 General Conference) has been on record for high level Soviet-American negotiations for peace. And for years MFSA has supported this official Methodist stand, and called for an end to the cold war, along with Quakers and many others from this and other lands. But how should we judge ourselves if we now ignored a speech, from whatever source, which gives promise of serving perhaps these important peace goals we so long have sought?

We recently (October, 1953) quoted Mr. Churchill, the Pope, and others on the importance of easing international tensions by launching big power negotiations for peace, not because we had embraced their political programs, but because we considered those particular statements important in the long struggle in which we were engaged with many others, to ease tensions, end the cold war, and achieve international peace and security.

After Mr. Eisenhower's speech on atomic energy, the U. S. asked the U. S. S. R. to join it in high level peace talks in the field of atomic energy. The Soviet Union accepted, and the acceptance was headlined (we hope accurately) as marking a break in the cold war. The initial talks between Mr. Dulles and Mr. Zarubin began in what was described as "a friendly atmosphere."

The Soviet Union has promised to consider Mr. Eisenhower's proposals seriously, and the U. S. has agreed that the talks need not be confined to those proposals. The Soviet reply (excerpted below) considers Mr. Eisenhower's proposal inadequate since it admittedly deals with only a small percentage of the world's atomic energy and leaves untouched the great bulk of that energy now being devoted almost exclusively to preparation for a war of atomic annihilation. Soviet spokesmen demand international outlawry of atomic, hydrogen or biological weapons of mass destruction—coupled with admittedly difficult agreement on a system of strict international control.

Since making his atomic energy proposal at the U. N. Assembly, Mr. Eisenhower has announced the future withdrawal of two land divisions from Korea. He has stressed that this does not mean a weakening of our military position in Korea, but a greater future reliance on air power and new weapons. There have been hints that if we fight again in Asia, we will no longer be restrained against bombing China or using atomic weapons. In his State of the Union message this month to Congress, Mr. Eisenhower stressed intended use of atomic weapons in any future war. It is well to remind ourselves and our leaders that use again of the atomic weapon of mass destruction can evoke a retaliation which citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki lacked power to effect.

COMMITTEE HEARING TRANSCRIPT AVAILABLE

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has printed its record of your Editor's two-day hearing last July "in limited quantity." Any interested reader may order from the committee or from his congressman, House Office Bldg., Washington, D. C., one copy free of charge (Hearing Regarding Jack R. McMichael, July 30 and 31, 1953). Or copies may be ordered at \$1.25 each from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. MFSA had hoped shortly after the hearings to secure the funds to publish the full transcript, but did not get enough money for that costly project.

BACK BULLETINS WANTED

The Methodist Historical Society requests the following back Bulletins to complete its file: 1912, No. 2 and No. 3; 1916, October; 1921, January; 1922, December; 1923, January; 1927, December 15; 1941, all issues; 1942, February, March and May; 1943, No. 9, No. 10 and No. 11 (published between November and December); 1947, October; 1948, April. If you can meet this request by providing any of these back issues, please let us know.

And if you yourself would like more recent back issues, and will use them to enlist new Federation members—send that word and postage to our president, Rev. Dr. Loyd Worley, 573 Farmington Avenue, Hartford 5, Connecticut.

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

What prospects does the New Year offer for progress toward peace and more democracy? These two objectives, demanded alike by the moral imperatives of our religion and the immediate need to escape the wrath to come embodied in atomic warfare, are indivisible. But limited space compels us to postpone the democracy sector of our analysis to next month.

The Old Year, taking into history the achievement of stopping the Korean war, went out with gestures toward peace . . . these were the agreement for a four power conference; arrangements to discuss with Russia possible constructive use of atomic energy and the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction; the withdrawal of two divisions from Korea. What promise of peace do these happenings offer the world?

The opportunity for peace in Asia that was opened by the truce in Korea was immediately wrecked by our policy of continuing through our aid the seven-year war for independence in Indo-China which the French were about ready to give up. The increasing danger of extension of that war was spotlighted by Dulles' threatening warning to China and by Russia's use of the report that military aid we sent to Thailand was going to the Viet-Nam forces. Our announcement that the Indo-China situation was from the same pattern as Korea, ties in with Rhee's recent visit to Chiang concerning plans to carry out our policy of "fighting Asians with Asians." As long as either of these three situations last, let alone all three of them linked together, there can be no peace in Asia nor in the world.

The proposal for a pool of atomic resources for constructive purposes and the withdrawal of two divisions from Korea are related. Both the Pentagon and Dulles made haste to proclaim that the withdrawal did not mean any weakening of our forces in Korea or our willingness to aid others in "the world struggle against communism." It merely registered a strategy of mobile war from air and sea with use of the smaller atomic weapons, and so fewer ground forces. This was evidently what Dulles had in mind for Europe when he threatened a change in our program if we did not get a German army quickly approved. This is a return to the old theory of a quick and easy victory by strategic bombing, made more attractive by the use of atomic weapons. As before, it makes the cities of West Europe and Great Britain expendable, this time in a war of extermination. And we are supposed to be a Christian nation?

This situation ties in with the discussion about the use of atomic energy. It should make it plain that any plans for peaceful use of that new power which do not include the prohibition of weapons of extermination can open no road to peace. Until the U. S. is willing to say it accepts the principle of prohibition and will sit down to work out the necessary controls, disarmament will not begin and rearmament, with all its dangers, will go on until the people of Japan, Germany and France decide to stop it. That is if the war of extermination does not intervene. The failure to date, as a section of our press is at last admitting, has been due to our insistence upon a plan of ownership and control of atomic resources which would leave the socialist nations at the mercy of the U. S. dominated capitalist bloc.

What promise of peace there is in the pending Four Power discussion depends upon whether we are willing, as most of the world has been asking, to substitute negotiation for the dictation of our cold war policy. Dulles is reported as saying we are now able to take the initiative for peace away from

Russia because we can now negotiate from positions of strength. That used to mean primarily our monopoly of the atomic bomb, now it means basically our stockpile of atomic weapons, and our alleged ability to deliver them. As if military might can finally outweigh justice and reason!

Then comes the moral cloak: "We do not regard the conference table as the place where we surrender our principles, but rather as the place for making our principles prevail." Which principles? Those of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, or those of Eisenhower's speech to the governors about Indo-China: "If we lose Indo-China . . . the peninsula would be scarcely defensible. The tin and tungsten we so greatly value from that area would cease coming . . ."

There can be no peace for us or the world as long as our policy makers talk and plan in terms of overthrow of the social revolution now taking place, as their own wiser heads admit, in the backward and undeveloped sections of the world. Until the fact of co-existence, and the necessity of peaceful co-existence are accepted as the basis of foreign policy, the road to peace cannot be opened. This is the challenge of 1954 to the churches.
H.F.W.

SOVIET REPLY TO EISENHOWER PROPOSALS

On December 21, the Soviet Government issued an official statement of reply to President Eisenhower's U.N. speech on atomic energy, excerpted in some detail in the December Bulletin. The N. Y. Times reported the Soviet statement "was free from vituperation, was fairly well balanced and seemed to invite discussion. President Eisenhower was referred to as an 'outstanding military leader.' The whole tone gave the surface impression of a government desperately eager to rid the world and itself of the burden of atomic armaments." There follow excerpts from the Soviet statement:

"In its present form, the proposal tabled by the United States does not stop the growing production of atomic weapons, neither does it limit the possibility of the use of these weapons.

"This proposal would have added importance if it arose from the recognition of the necessity to prohibit the atomic weapon, which is a weapon of aggression. But the necessity of prohibiting the atomic weapon is not mentioned in the President's speech, despite the fact that President Eisenhower stresses the particular danger of the atomic weapon which exists today for the peoples of the whole world in the present atomic epoch.

"That is why the Soviet Government, as before, considers the most important and urgent problem to be the unconditional banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons, as well as of other types of weapons of mass destruction, with the simultaneous establishment of a strict international control over this banning.

(The statement points out that under Mr. Eisenhower's proposal, only a small per cent of atomic materials will be set aside for peaceful purposes.)

"Hence it follows that the main part of the atomic materials will, as before, be directed to the production of new atomic and hydrogen bombs, and that there remains the full possibility of a further accumulation of the atomic weapon and the creation of new types of this weapon of even greater destructive power. Consequently, this proposal, in its present form, in no way ties the hands of the governments which have the opportunity to produce atomic and hydrogen weapons.

"The acceptance of this proposal in no way limits an aggressor as regards the use of the atomic weapon for any purpose or at any time. Consequently, this proposal in no way reduces the danger of atomic attack. Neither does it provide for a pledge not to use this weapon.

"The task of all peace-loving states is not restricted to the allocation for peaceful aims of a small part of atomic material. It is necessary that not some part but the whole mass of atomic material be directed completely to peaceful aims, which would open up unheard of possibilities for the progress of industry, agriculture and transport.

"All this demands recognition of the necessity to ban atomic weapons, together with the establishment of international control over this ban, and an unconditional pledge not to use these weapons.

"As to President Eisenhower's statement on the confidential or diplomatic talks concerning his proposal, the Soviet Government, following consistently its peace-loving policy, expresses its readiness to take part in such negotiations.

"The Soviet Government bases its attitude on the idea that during such talks the following proposal of the Soviet Union will be considered at the same time:

"The states taking part in the agreement, guided by their wish for reducing international tension, undertake solemn and unconditional pledges not to use atomic, hydrogen or other weapons of mass extermination.

"The achieving of an international agreement on this question could be an important step on the road to the complete withdrawal from the armaments of states of all atomic hydrogen and other weapons of mass extermination—together with the establishment of a strict international control which would insure the fulfillment of the agreement on the ban of the use of atomic energy for military ends.

"The Soviet Union, filled with deep concern for safeguarding mankind from the death-carrying atomic and hydrogen weapons, will devote all its efforts so that these weapons could never be turned against people."

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year.

25c per copy.

Issued monthly, October through May, and one summer issue.

METHODIST FEDERATION FOR SOCIAL ACTION
(Unofficial)

President, Dr. Loyd Worley; Vice-Presidents, Bishop J. W. E. Bowen, Rev. Clarence T. R. Nelson, Mrs. Mary Phillips, Rev. Edward Peet; Recording Secretary, Rev. Lee H. Ball; Assistant Recording Secretary, Miss Janice M. Roberts; Treasurer, Rev. Edward Peet.

Membership Secretary, Mark Chamberlin

Field Secretaries: I. DeQuincy Newman, Willard Uphaus

Editorial Secretary and Editor, Jack R. McMichael.

Editorial Office and Office of Publication

P. O. Box 327, Gresham, Oregon.

Re-entered as second class matter Sept. 15, 1953, at the Postoffice at Gresham, Oregon, under the Act of August 24, 1912.